arXiv:1605.00296v1 [math.LO] 1 May 2016

CHANG'S CONJECTURE AND SEMIPROPERNESS OF NONREASONABLE POSETS

SEAN D. COX

Abstract. Let $\mathbb{Q}$ denote the poset which adds a Cohen real then shoots a club through the complement of $\big([\omega_2]^\omega\big)^V$ with countable conditions. We prove that the version of Strong Chang's Conjecture from [16] implies semiproperness of $\mathbb{Q}$, and that semiproperness of $\mathbb{Q}$—in fact semiproperness of any poset which is sufficiently *nonreasonable* in the sense of Foreman-Magidor [3]—implies the version of Strong Chang's Conjecture from [20] and [15]. In particular, semiproperness of $\mathbb{Q}$ has large cardinal strength, which answers a question of Friedman-Krueger [5]. One corollary of our work is that the version of Strong Chang's Conjecture from [16] does not imply the existence of a precipitous ideal on ω_1.

1. Introduction

Foreman-Magidor-Shelah [4] proved the consistency of *Martin's Maximum (MM)*, and isolated an interesting consequence:

† : Every poset which preserves stationary subsets of ω_1 is semiproper

In fact they showed that MM implies generalized stationary set reflection, which in turn implied †. They proved that † implies precipitousness of the nonstationary ideal on ω_1; thus † has large cardinal strength. They also proved that generalized stationary set reflection implies presaturation of the nonstationary ideal on ω_1; recently Usuba [18] reduced the assumption to "† holds for posets of size $\leq 2^{\omega_1}$". He also proved that this bounded dagger principle implies a version of Chang's Conjecture.

The † principle is also interesting for particular posets definable in ZFC. For example, it is a proof of ZFC that Namba forcing preserves stationary subsets of ω_1 (and even stronger properties, by [13]). Moreover:[1]

Theorem 1 (Shelah [13]; see also Section 3 of Doebler [1])**.** *Semiproperness of Namba forcing is equivalent to a certain version of Strong Chang's Conjecture (the version we call SCC^{cof} in Section 2).*

This paper is about the † principle for the poset which adds a Cohen real, then shoots a continuous $\subset$-chain of length ω_1 through $[\omega_2]^\omega - V$ using countable conditions, which we'll denote by

$$\mathrm{Add}(\omega) * \dot{\mathbb{C}}\big([\omega_2]^\omega - V\big) \tag{1}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E05,03E35, 03E55, 03E57, 03E65 .

[1]Shelah [13] Chapter XII proves that semiproperness of Namba forcing implies SCC$^{\mathrm{cof}}$; and a minor variation in the proof of Section 3 of Doebler [1] proves that SCC$^{\mathrm{cof}}$ implies semiproperness of Namba forcing.

This poset has appeared in several applications in the literature, such as separating internal unboundedness from internal stationarity (Krueger [9]) and for applications involving thin stationary sets and disjoint club sequences (Friedman-Krueger [5]). Theorems of Gitik [6] and Velickovic [19] easily imply that this poset always preserves stationary subsets of ω_1; and in fact Friedman-Krueger [5] proved that it always satisfies a stronger (and RCS-iterable) condition of Shelah which is intermediate between "preserves stationary subsets of ω_1" and "semiproper". They asked:

Question 2 (Question 1 of Friedman-Krueger [5])**.** *Assuming Martin's Maximum, the poset $Add(\omega) * \dot{\mathbb{C}}\big([\omega_2]^\omega - V\big)$ is semiproper. Is this poset semiproper in general?*

We give a strong negative answer to Question 2, which we now describe. Foreman-Magidor [3] defined a poset to be *reasonable* iff it preserves the stationarity of $\big([\theta]^\omega\big)^V$ for all $\theta \geq \omega_1$; this is a weak version of proper forcings (which are required to preserve *all* stationary subsets of $[\theta]^\omega$). Intuitively, a nonreasonable poset is as non-proper as possible while (possibly) preserving ω_1; it kills the stationarity of the former club $[\theta]^\omega$ for some θ. In the following results it will be useful to stratify the notion of reasonableness; let us say that a poset is *reasonable at* $[\theta]^\omega$ if it preserves the stationarity of $\big([\theta]^\omega\big)^V$, and *nonreasonable at* $[\theta]^\omega$ otherwise. So in particular, the poset from Question 2 is nonreasonable at $[\omega_2]^\omega$. Notice that any ω_1-preserving poset is reasonable at $[\omega_1]^\omega$; **so for ω_1-preserving posets, the strongest possible degree of nonreasonableness is to be nonreasonable at** $[\omega_2]^\omega$. Namba forcing is always nonreasonable at $[\omega_2]^\omega$, and so is the poset (1); however the latter preserves all uncountable cofinalities.

We prove that semiproperness of the poset from the Friedman-Krueger question, and semiproperness of nonreasonable posets in general, are closely related to strong versions of Chang's Conjecture. The definitions of SCC, $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$, and $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$ are given in Section 2.

Theorem 3. *If there exists a semiproper poset which is nonreasonable at $[\omega_2]^\omega$, then Strong Chang's Conjecture (SCC) holds.*

Theorem 4. *The principle SCC^{cof}_{gap} implies that*

$$Add(\omega) * \dot{\mathbb{C}}\big([\omega_2]^\omega - V\big)$$

is semiproper.

We also prove the following theorem, which is a minor modification of an argument of Sakai [11]:

Theorem 5 (after [11])**.** *Assume there exists a normal ideal $\mathcal{J}$ on ω_2 such that $\wp(\omega_2)/\mathcal{J}$ is a proper forcing. Then SCC^{cof}_{gap} holds.*

Now by Jech-Magidor-Mitchell-Prikry [7], an ideal satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 5 can be forced from a measurable cardinal.[2] Moreover SCC implies Chang's Conjecture (CC) which is equiconsistent with an ω_1-Erdős cardinal. So the results above have the following corollary:

[2]In fact one can arrange that the quotient is forcing equivalent to a σ-closed poset; and moreover the ideal can consistently be the nonstationary ideal on ω_2 restricted to ordinals of uncountable cofinality.

Corollary 6.

$$\begin{aligned} & CON\Big(ZFC \ + \ \textit{there is a measurable cardinal}\Big) \\ \implies \quad & CON\Big(ZFC \ + \ \textit{the poset } Add(\omega) * \dot{\mathbb{C}}\big([\omega_2]^\omega - V\big) \textit{ is semiproper}\Big) \\ \implies \quad & CON\Big(ZFC \ + \ \textit{there is an } \omega_1\textit{-Erdős cardinal}\Big) \end{aligned}$$

We can also draw another corollary from Theorem 5 and core model theory. By Foreman-Magidor-Shelah [4], the † principle implies that NS_{ω_1} is precipitous; and † implies semiproperness of Namba forcing which in turn (by Shelah's Theorem 1) is equivalent to $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$. In light of these facts, a natural question is whether $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$ implies precipitousness of NS_{ω_1}. It does not; not even the stronger $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$ implies there is a precipitous ideal on ω_1:

Corollary 7. *The principle SCC^{cof}_{gap} (the strongest of the Chang's Conjecture variations considered in this paper) does* ***not*** *imply that there is a precipitous ideal on ω_1.*

Section 2 provides the relevant background. Section 3 proves Theorem 3; in fact a stronger theorem is proved there. Section 4 proves Theorems 4 and 5. Section 5 proves Corollary 7. Section 6 provides some concluding remarks about the relationship between the various strong Chang's Conjectures and special Aronszajn trees on ω_2, and the relationship between bounded dagger principles and semiproperness of the poset (1).

2. Preliminaries

If M and N are sets which have transitive intersection with ω_1, we write $M \sqsubseteq N$ to mean that $M \subseteq N$ and $M \cap \omega_1 = N \cap \omega_1$. A poset $\mathbb{Q}$ is *semiproper* iff for all sufficiently large θ and club-many (equivalently, every) countable $M \prec (H_\theta, \in, \mathbb{Q})$ and every $q \in M \cap \mathbb{Q}$ there is a $q' \leq q$ such that

$$q' \Vdash \check{M} \sqsubseteq \check{M}[\dot{G}]$$

We frequently use the following fact (see e.g. Larson-Shelah [10]):

Fact 8. *If θ is regular uncountable, $\mathfrak{A}$ is a structure on H_θ in a countable language which has definable Skolem functions, $M \prec \mathfrak{A}$, and Y is a subset of some $\eta \in M$, then*

$$Sk^{\mathfrak{A}}(M \cup Y) = \{f(y) \mid y \in [Y]^{<\omega} \textit{ and } f \in M \cap {}^{[\eta]^{<\omega}}H_\theta\}$$

The classic Chang's Conjecture, which we will abbreviate by CC, has many equivalent formulations.[3] One version states: for every $\theta \geq \omega_2$ and every algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ on H_θ, there is an $X \prec \mathfrak{A}$ with $|X \cap \omega_2| \geq \omega_1$ and $X \cap \omega_1 \in \omega_1$.

We will refer to several strengthenings of Chang's Conjecture. **We caution the reader that the notation for various strengthenings of CC is very inconsistent across the literature**. For example:

[3] CC is often expressed by $(\omega_2, \omega_1) \twoheadrightarrow (\omega_1, \omega)$

- the notation CC^* is used in the literature to refer to at least four distinct concepts (which are not known to be equivalent, as far as the author is aware). The CC^* from Todorcevic-Torres Perez [16] is what we are calling $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$, whereas the apparently weaker CC^* from Usuba [18] and Torres Perez-Wu [17] is what we are calling $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$. The CC^* from Todorcevic [15] is what we are calling SCC. The CC^* from Doebler-Schindler [2] is yet another version which is much stronger and will not be considered here.[4]
- "Strong Chang's Conjecture" from Woodin [20] is not the same as "Strong Chang's Conjecture" from Sharpe-Welch [12] (Woodin's is what we call SCC, and Sharpe-Welch's is what we call $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$). A similar discrepancy appears in the use of the notation CC^+ in [20] and [12], though we will not deal with either of these versions. The "Strong Chang's Conjecture" of Foreman-Magidor-Shelah [4] is apparently weaker than the "Strong Chang's Conjecture of Woodin [20].

Table 1 provides a translation for the various uses in the literature.

Definition 9. Strong Chang's Conjecture *(SCC) is the statement: for all sufficiently large regular θ, all wellorders Δ of H_θ, and all countable $M \prec (H_\theta, \in, \Delta)$, there exists a $\widetilde{M}$ such that*

- $\widetilde{M} \prec (H_\theta, \in, \Delta)$*;*
- $M \sqsubset \widetilde{M}$*; and*
- $\widetilde{M} \cap [sup(M \cap \omega_2), \omega_2) \neq \emptyset$

SCC implies CC. In fact, SCC is equivalent to saying that club-many $M \in [H_\theta]^\omega$ can be $\sqsubset$-extended to a model whose intersection with ω_2 is uncountable; whereas CC is equivalent to this holding for just stationarily many $M \in [H_\theta]^\omega$. We will use even further strengthenings of SCC. The following requires that one can not only obtain proper end-extensions (as SCC requires), but that an end-extension with arbitrarily large supremum below ω_2 can be found:

Definition 10. *SCC^{cof} is the statement: for all sufficiently large regular θ and every wellorder Δ of H_θ and every countable $N \prec (H_\theta, \in, \Delta)$, there are cofinally many $\alpha \in \omega_2$ such that there exists an $N' \prec (H_\theta, \in, \Delta\})$ where:*

(1) $N \sqsubseteq N'$;
(2) $N' \cap [\alpha, \omega_2) \neq \emptyset$

Finally, the strongest version we will encounter is the following, which requires arbitrarily large gaps above the model to be $\sqsubset$-extended:

Definition 11. *SCC^{cof}_{gap} is defined exactly the same as SCC^{cof}, except the following additional requirement is placed on the N' from Definition 10:*

$$N' \cap [sup(N \cap \omega_2), \alpha) = \emptyset$$

The additional requirement for $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$ will be important in the proof of Theorem 4. The following implications are straightforward:

$$\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}} \implies \mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}} \implies \mathrm{SCC} \implies \mathrm{CC}$$

[4] Doebler-Schindler [2] proved that their version implies †, which by Usuba [18] implies presaturation of NS_{ω_1}. Thus by Steel [14] and Jensen-Steel [8], the Doebler-Schindler version of CC^* has consistency strength at least a Woodin cardinal; whereas all the versions of Chang's Conjecture considered in this paper can be forced from a measurable cardinal.

TABLE 1. Translating strong versions of Chang's Conjecture

Elsewhere in the literature		Corresponds to our:		
Source	Their notation	SCC	$\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$	$\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$
Todorcevic [15]	CC^*	✓		
Todorcevic-Torres Perez [16]	CC^*			✓
Usuba [18]	CC^*	✓		
Usuba [18]	CC^{**}		✓	
Torres Perez-Wu [17]	CC^*		✓	
Doebler [1]	CC^*	✓		
Shelah [13]	version in XII Theorem 2.5		✓	
Sharpe-Welch [12]	SCC		✓	
Woodin [20]	SCC (Def 9.101 part 2)	✓		

The following lemma is standard and streamlines arguments involving variants of SCC, by allowing one to replace "every" by "club-many", but *without* having to strengthen the algebra in which the end extensions are required to be elementary.

Lemma 12. *The following are equivalent:*

1. *SCC^{cof}_{gap} (as in Definition 10);*
2. *There are club-many $N \in [H_{\omega_3}]^\omega$ such that for cofinally many $\alpha \in \omega_2$, there exists an $N' \prec (H_{\omega_3}, \in)$ where:*
   - (a) *$N \sqsubseteq N'$;*
   - (b) *$N' \cap [\alpha, \omega_2) \neq \emptyset$*
   - (c) *$N' \cap [sup(N \cap \omega_2), \alpha) = \emptyset$*

Lemma 12 is similar to Lemma 9.103 of [20]; however since there are some confusing typos in the "3 implies 1" direction of the latter, we provide a short proof.[5]

Proof. That 1 implies 2 is trivial. For the other direction, fix a regular $\theta > \omega_3$ and a wellorder Δ on H_θ. Fix a countable $\widetilde{N} \prec (H_\theta, \in, \Delta)$. The assumptions and the elementarity of $\widetilde{N}$ imply there is some algebra $\mathfrak{A}$ on H_{ω_3} such that $\mathfrak{A} \in \widetilde{N}$ and $\mathfrak{A}$ has the properties listed in 2. In particular since $\mathfrak{A} \in \widetilde{N}$ then $N := \widetilde{N} \cap H_{\omega_3} \prec \mathfrak{A}$; so there are cofinally many $\alpha < \omega_2$ with the properties listed in 2. Fix such an α and an $N' \sqsupseteq N$ such that $N' \prec (H_{\omega_3}, \in)$ and N' has the other properties listed in 2. Define

$$\widetilde{N}' := \{f(y) \mid f \in \widetilde{N} \cap {}^{\omega_2}H_\theta \text{ and } y \in N'\}$$

Since $\widetilde{N} \prec (H_\theta, \in, \Delta)$ and $(H_\theta, \in, \Delta)$ has definable Skolem functions, then Fact 8 implies that $\widetilde{N}' \prec (H_\theta, \in, \Delta)$. Clearly $\widetilde{N} \subset \widetilde{N}'$. Furthermore if $f(y) < \omega_2$ where $f \in \widetilde{N}$ and $y \in N'$ then without loss of generality $f : \omega_2 \to \omega_2$; so $f \in \widetilde{N} \cap H_{\omega_3} = N \subset N'$. Since y and f are both in N' then $f(y) \in N'$. This shows that $\widetilde{N}' \cap \omega_2 = N' \cap \omega_2$, and it follows that $\widetilde{N}'$ has the desired properties with respect to $\widetilde{N}$. □

The following lemma is very similar to Lemma 12, so we omit the proof:

Lemma 13. *The following are equivalent:*

1. *Strong Chang's Conjecture (Definition 9)*
2. *There are club-many $N \in [H_{\omega_3}]^\omega$ such that there exists an $N' \prec (H_{\omega_3}, \in)$ where:*

[5] Lemma 9.103 of [20] is the version for SCC; Lemma 12 above is the version for $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$.

(a) $N \sqsubset N'$;
(b) $N' \cap [sup(N \cap \omega_2), \omega_2) \neq \emptyset$

The following lemma basically says that if $M \sqsubseteq N$ and they have access to the same wellorder of H_{ω_2}, then $N \cap \omega_2$ is an end extension of $M \cap \omega_2$.[6]

Lemma 14. *Suppose w is a wellorder on H_{ω_2} and M is a countable elementary substructure of $(H_{\omega_2}, \in, w)$. Suppose N is another countable model, perhaps in some outer model of V, such that $M \sqsubseteq N$ and $N \cap H^V_{\omega_2} \prec (H^V_{\omega_2}, \in, w)$. Then $N \cap \omega_2^V$ is an end-extension of $M \cap \omega_2^V$; i.e.*

$$N \cap sup(M \cap \omega_2^V) = M \cap \omega_2^V$$

Proof. One direction is trivial, since $M \subset N$ by assumption. For the other direction, let $\zeta \in N \cap \sup(M \cap \omega_2^V)$. Since $\sup(M \cap \omega_2^V)$ is a limit ordinal there is some $\beta \in M \cap \omega_2^V$ such that $\zeta < \beta$. Let f be the w-least bijection from $\omega_1 \to \beta$. Since $\beta \in M \subset N$, $M \prec (H^V_{\omega_2}, \in, w)$, and $N \cap H^V_{\omega_2} \prec (H^V_{\omega_2}, \in, w)$, then $f \in M \cap N$. Then

$$\zeta \in N \cap \beta = f[N \cap \omega_1] = f[M \cap \omega_1] = M \cap \beta$$

□

Finally we recall a standard fact:

Fact 15. *If $\mathbb{P}$ is a proper poset, S is a stationary subset of $[H_\theta]^\omega$ for some $\theta \geq 2^{|\mathbb{P}|}$, and G is generic for $\mathbb{P}$, then $V[G]$ believes that there are stationarily many $N \in S$ such that G includes a master condition for N.*

Proof. If not then there is some condition p and some name $\dot{\mathfrak{A}}$ for an algebra on H^V_θ such that

$$p \Vdash \forall N \in \check{S} \;\; N \prec \dot{\mathfrak{A}} \implies \dot{G} \text{ does not include a master condition for } N \tag{2}$$

The stationarity of S ensures that there is some $N \in S$ such that $p \in N$ and $N = \widetilde{N} \cap H_\theta$ for some

$$\widetilde{N} \prec (H_{\theta^+}, \in, \dot{\mathfrak{A}})$$

Since $\mathbb{P}$ is proper and $p \in \widetilde{N}$ then there is a $p' \leq p$ which is a master condition for $\widetilde{N}$. Since $\dot{\mathfrak{A}} \in \widetilde{N}$ and p' is a master condition for $\widetilde{N}$ then

$$p' \Vdash \widetilde{N} \cap H^V_\theta = N \prec \dot{\mathfrak{A}}, \; N \in S, \;\; \text{and } \dot{G} \text{ includes a master condition for } N$$

Since $p' \leq p$, this contradicts (2). □

3. Proof of Theorem 3

We actually prove a statement which is a bit stronger than than Theorem 3. If $H \supseteq \omega_1$ and $S \subseteq [H]^\omega$, we say that S is *semistationary* iff

$$\{N \in [H]^\omega \mid \exists M \in S \; M \sqsubseteq N\} \text{ is stationary}$$

Clearly every stationary set is semistationary, but the converse is false. Just as properness is equivalent to preservation of stationary sets, Shelah [13] shows that semiproperness of a poset $\mathbb{Q}$ is equivalent to: every semistationary set in V remains semistationary in $V^{\mathbb{Q}}$. We prove the following theorem, which is more general than Theorem 3 in two ways:

[6] Lemma 14 is the reason that our Definition 9 of SCC is equivalent to part 2 of Definition 9.101 of [20].

(1) It deals with arbitrary outer models, rather than just forcing extensions;
(2) It only requires that stationary sets in the inner model are semistationary in the outer model. Since every stationary set is semistationary (but not vice-versa), this is apparently stronger than requiring that all semistationary sets remain semistationary (which is equivalent to semiproperness in the case of forcing extensions).

Theorem 16. *Assume $V \subset W$ are models of ZFC, every stationary set of countable models in V remains **semi**stationary in W, and $\left([\omega_2]^\omega\right)^V$ is nonstationary in W. Then*

$$V \models \ SCC$$

Proof. First note that the assumptions ensure that V and W have the same ω_1; otherwise the stationary set $\left([\omega_1]^\omega\right)^V$ in V would fail to be semistationary in W.

Working in V, fix a regular $\theta \geq \omega_3$ and a wellorder Δ of H_θ. Let

$$\mathfrak{A} = (H_\theta, \in, \Delta)$$

By Lemma 13 and Lemma 14 it suffices to prove that there are club-many $M \in [H_\theta]^\omega$ which can be $\sqsubset$-extended to an elementary substructure of $\mathfrak{A}$ which includes some ordinal in $\omega_2 - M$. Suppose toward a contradiction that this fails; let S denote the stationary collection of counterexamples, and without loss of generality assume $M \prec \mathfrak{A}$ for every $M \in S$.

The hypotheses of the theorem ensure that

$$W \models \ S \text{ is semistationary in } [H_\theta^V]^\omega \tag{3}$$

Work in W. Let $F : [\omega_2^V]^{<\omega} \to \omega_2^V$ witness that $\left([\omega_2]^\omega\right)^V$ is nonstationary in W; so

$$W \models \ \forall z \in [\omega_2^V]^\omega \quad z \text{ closed under } F \implies z \notin H_\theta^V$$

(Here we use H_θ^V, which is an element of W, because we are not necessarily assuming that V is definable in W). Let $\Omega > \theta$ be regular and define

$$\mathfrak{B} := (H_\Omega^W, \in, \{\mathfrak{A}, F\})$$

By (3) and standard facts about liftings of stationary sets, in W there is some countable $N \prec \mathfrak{B}$ such that $N \sqsupseteq M$ for some $M \in S$. Since $F \in N$ then $N \cap \omega_2^V \notin V$; together with the facts that$M \in V$ and $M \subset N$ this implies

$$M \cap \omega_2^V \subsetneq N \cap \omega_2^V$$

Pick some $\zeta \in \omega_2^V \cap (N - M)$ and consider the following set, which is an element of V (note that $\mathfrak{A}$ has definable Skolem functions):

$$M' := \mathrm{Sk}^{\mathfrak{A}}(M \cup \{\zeta\})$$

Since $N \prec \mathfrak{B}$ (so $\mathfrak{A} \in N$) and $M \cup \{\zeta\} \subset N$, then $M' \subseteq N$. So in summary we have that $M' \prec \mathfrak{A}$, $M \subset M' \subseteq N$ and $M \sqsubset N$. It follows that $M \sqsubset M' \prec \mathfrak{A}$. This contradicts that $M \in S$.

□

Remark 17. *Recall that Shelah* [13] *proved that semiproperness of Namba forcing implies SCC^{cof}. It is tempting to try to modify the proof of Theorem 16 above to achieve SCC^{cof}, rather than just SCC, as follows. Instead of working with M, work instead with some maximal $\sqsubseteq$-extension of M which is elementary in $\mathfrak{A}$. The*

problem is that Theorem 16 implies that such a $\sqsubseteq$-maximal extension will be uncountable, and thus apparently irrelevant to the preservation of semistationary sets of countable models.

4. Proofs of Theorems 4 and 5

Before proceeding to the proofs of Theorems 4 and 5, note that Sakai [11] proved that if there is a normal ideal $\mathcal{J}$ on ω_2 such that $P(\omega_2)/\mathcal{J}$ is a semiproper poset, then $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$ holds. However it is not clear if $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$ would suffice to prove Theorem 4; i.e. we seem to need $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$, not just $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$, to prove semiproperness of the poset

$$\mathrm{Add}(\omega) * \dot{\mathbb{C}}\big([\omega_2]^\omega - V\big)$$

4.1. **Proof of Theorem 4.** Let $\theta \geq 2^{\omega_2}$. It suffices to find club-many $N \in [H_\theta]^\omega$ for which the poset

$$\mathrm{Add}(\omega) * \dot{\mathbb{C}}\big([\omega_2]^\omega - V\big)$$

is semiproper. Fix some $w \in H_{\omega_3}$ which is a wellorder of H_{ω_2}. Fix any $N \prec (H_\theta, \in)$ such that $w \in N$. Since $w \in N$ then Lemma 14 implies:

$$N \subseteq Q \sqsubseteq R \text{ and } Q, R \prec (H_\theta, \in) \implies R \cap \sup(Q \cap \omega_2) = Q \cap \omega_2 \tag{4}$$

Let $(p, \dot{f})$ be a condition in $N \cap \mathrm{Add}(\omega) * \dot{\mathbb{C}}\big([\omega_2]^\omega - V\big)$; we want to find a semigeneric condition for N below it.

Let σ be $\big(V, \mathrm{Add}(\omega)\big)$-generic (note $p \in \sigma$ automatically) and $f := \dot{f}_\sigma$.

Claim 18. *There is some $M \prec (H_\theta[\sigma], \in)$ such that*

- $f \in M$
- $M \cap \omega_2 \notin V$
- $N[\sigma] \sqsubseteq M$

Note that this claim will finish the proof of Theorem 4, because there will then be some $f' \leq f$ which is a totally generic condition for $\big(M, \mathbb{C}([\omega_2]^\omega - V)\big)$.[7] Then since $N[\sigma] \sqsubseteq M$ and f' is a generic condition for $\big(M, \mathbb{C}([\omega_2]^\omega - V)\big)$, then f' is a semigeneric condition for $\big(N[\sigma], \mathbb{C}([\omega_2]^\omega - V)\big)$; and since p is an $\big(N, \mathrm{Add}(\omega)\big)$ master condition then $(p, \dot{f}')$ will be the semigeneric condition we seek (where $\dot{f}'$ is a name for f').

Proof. (of Claim 18) The following coding argument in some ways resembles arguments from Gitik [6] and Velickovic [19]. In $V[\sigma]$ we recursively define three sequences of elementary substructures of $(H_\theta^V, \in)$:

$$\langle Q_n^{\mathrm{M}} \mid n < \omega \rangle$$
$$\langle Q_n^{\mathrm{Y}} \mid n < \omega \rangle$$
$$\langle Q_n^{\mathrm{N}} \mid n < \omega \rangle$$

Intuitively, the "M" (for Move) sequence will tell us when to move to the next decimal place; the "Y" (for Yes) sequence will indicate where to put a 1; and the "N" (for No) sequence will indicate where to put a 0.

Define a function

$$\mathrm{Active} : \omega \to \{M, Y, N\}$$

[7] This is a well-known fact. Just fix any generic chain for M below the condition f and put $M \cap \omega_2$ at the top of the chain; since $M \cap \omega_2 \notin V$ the resulting object is a condition.

as follows. If n is even, say $n = 2k$, then Active$(n) = Y$ if the k-th bit of σ is 1, Active$(n) = N$ if the k-th bit of σ is 0. If n is odd, then Active(n) is always M. For $X \in \{M, Y, N\}$ and $n < \omega$ we say that X is active at stage n if Active$(n) = X$; otherwise X is passive at stage n.

Set $Q_0^X := N$ for all $X \in \{M, Y, N\}$. Assume Q_n^X is defined for each $X \in \{M, Y, N\}$. Set $s_n^X := \sup(Q_n^X \cap \omega_2)$ for $X \in \{\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{N}\}$, and $s_n := \max\{s_n^M, s_n^Y, s_n^N\}$. We then define the $n+1$-st models as follows:

- If X is passive at stage n then $Q_{n+1}^X := Q_n^X$.
- If X is active at stage n, then we use that $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$ holds in V to find some $Q_{n+1}^X \in V \cap [H_\theta^V]^\omega$ such that:
  - $Q_{n+1}^X \prec (H_\theta^V, \in)$;
  - $Q_n^X \sqsubset Q_{n+1}^X$;
  - $Q_{n+1}^X \cap [s_n^X, s_n) = \emptyset$;
  - $Q_{n+1}^X \cap [s_n, \omega_2) \neq \emptyset$;

This completes the recursive definition of the three sequences of models. Note that (4) and the construction of the models implies that for all $n < \omega$ and each $X \in \{M, Y, N\}$:

$$Q_{n+1}^X \cap s_n = Q_n^X \cap \omega_2 \tag{5}$$

Let

$$Q_\omega^X := \bigcup_{n \in \omega} Q_n^X$$

and set $z^X := Q_\omega^X \cap \omega_2$ for each $X \in \{M, Y, N\}$. Also define a sequence $\vec{\alpha}$ by setting $\alpha_0 := \sup(N \cap \omega_2)$, and for each $n \in \omega$, define α_{n+1} to be the least element of $Q_{n+1}^{\mathrm{Active}(n)} \cap [s_n, \omega_2)$.

Notice that the construction of the sequences of models ensures:

(1) If H is a transitive ZF^- model and z^M, z^Y, and z^N are all elements of H, then $\vec{\alpha} \in H$, via the following algorithm. Clearly $\alpha_0 \in H$ by transitivity. Given α_n, there is a *unique* $X_n \in \{M, Y, N\}$ such that $\alpha_n \in z^{X_n}$;[8] then α_{n+1} is the smallest ordinal $> \alpha_n$ which is missing from z^{X_n} but is in $\cup\{z^M, z^Y, z^N\}$. (This makes use of (5))

(2) σ can be decoded from the parameters $\vec{\alpha}$, z^Y, and z^N as follows: for $k \in \omega$, $\sigma(k) = 1$ if $\alpha_{2k} \in z^Y$, and $\sigma(k) = 0$ if $\alpha_{2k} \in z^N$.

Thus, since $\sigma \notin V$, it follows that there is at least one $X^* \in \{M, Y, N\}$ such that $z^{X^*} \notin V$. Note that since Add(ω) is ccc, then in particular σ automatically includes a master condition (namely $\emptyset$) for $Q_n^{X^*}$, for every $n < \omega$. It follows that $Q_n^{X^*}[\sigma] \cap ORD = Q_n^{X^*} \cap ORD$ for every $n \in \omega$. Also $\langle Q_n^{X^*}[\sigma] \mid n \in \omega \rangle$ is a $\prec$-chain of elementary submodels of $(H_\theta[\sigma], \in)$. Notice by construction that all these models have the same intersection with ω_1 also; namely $N \cap \omega_1$. Set

$$M := \bigcup_{n < \omega} Q_n^{X^*}[\sigma]$$

Then $N[\sigma] \sqsubseteq M$, $M \prec (H_\theta[\sigma], \in)$, and

$$M \cap \omega_2 = \bigcup_{n<\omega} \left(Q_n^{X^*}[\sigma] \cap \omega_2 \right) = \bigcup_{n<\omega} \left(Q_n^{X^*} \cap \omega_2 \right) = z^{X^*} \notin V$$

[8] Namely $X_n = \mathrm{Active}(n)$, though the function Active is not available to H.

This completes the proof of the claim. □

4.2. **Proof of Theorem 5.** Let $\mathcal{J}$ be a normal ideal on ω_2 such that $\wp(\omega_2)/\mathcal{J}$ is a proper forcing. Fix a sufficiently large regular θ and a wellorder Δ on H_θ; let

$$\mathfrak{A} := (H_\theta, \in, \Delta, \{\mathcal{J}\})$$

Since $\mathcal{J}$-positive sets are unbounded in ω_2, then to prove $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$ it suffices (by Lemma 12) to find club-many $N \in [H_\theta]^\omega$ such that:

$$\{\alpha < \omega_2 \mid \mathrm{Sk}^{\mathfrak{A}}(N \cup \{\alpha\}) \cap \alpha = N \cap \alpha\} \in \mathcal{J}^+$$

By Fact 8, for any $N \prec \mathfrak{A}$:

$$\mathrm{Sk}^{\mathfrak{A}}(N \cup \{\alpha\}) = \{f(\alpha) \mid f \in N \text{and } f \text{ is a function }\}$$

Thus it suffices to find club-many $N \in [H_\theta]^\omega$ such that

$$A_N := \{\alpha < \kappa \mid \forall f \in N \;\; f(\alpha) < \alpha \implies f(\alpha) \in N\} \in \mathcal{J}^+$$

Suppose toward a contradiction that

$$S := \{N \prec \mathfrak{A} \mid A_N \in \mathcal{J}\} \text{ is stationary in } [H_\theta]^\omega$$

Let U be generic for $P(\omega_2)/\mathcal{J}$ and let $j : V \to_U M_U$ be the generic ultrapower embedding. By Fact 15, there is some $N \in S$ (in fact stationarily many) such that U includes a master condition for N. Fix such an N for the remainder of the proof.

Set $\kappa := \omega_2^V$. Since $N \in S$ then $A_N \in \mathcal{J}$, which implies that $A_N \notin U$ and thus $\kappa \notin j(A_N)$. Also since $|N|^V < \mathrm{crit}(j)$ then $j(N) = j[N]$; so

$$j(A_N) = \{\alpha < \kappa \mid \forall f \in j(N) = j[N] \;\; f(\alpha) < \alpha \implies f(\alpha) \in j(N) = j[N]\}$$

Since $\kappa \notin j(A_N)$ there is some $f' \in j[N]$ such that $f'(\kappa) < \kappa$ but $f'(\kappa) \notin j[N]$; say $f' = j(f)$ where $f \in N$. Also note that $j[N] \cap \kappa = N \cap \kappa$. In summary, we have found an f such that:

$$f \in N,\; j(f)(\kappa) < \kappa, \text{ and } j(f)(\kappa) \notin N \tag{6}$$

Set $\beta := j(f)(\kappa)$; then $\kappa \in j\big(f^{-1}[\{\beta\}]\big)$ and so $f^{-1}[\{\beta\}] \in U$. Since U is a filter on $P^V(\kappa)$ then

$$V[U] \models \beta \text{ is the unique ordinal such that } f^{-1}[\{\beta\}] \in U$$

Back in V, let $\dot{\beta}_f$ be the name which denotes the unique value for which f is constant on a $\dot{U}$-measure one set, if such a thing exists. Since $f \in N$ then we can assume $\dot{\beta}_f \in N$. But then

$$j(f)(\kappa) = \beta = (\dot{\beta}_f)_U \in N$$

where the last relation is due to the fact that U includes a master condition for N. This contradicts (6).

5. Proof of Corollary 7

In this brief section we use Theorem 5 to produce a model where $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$ holds, but there is no precipitous ideal on ω_1.

Assume 0-pistol does not exist, and let K be the core model (see [21]). Work in K. Assume κ is a measurable cardinal and let G be $(K, \mathrm{Col}(\omega_1, < \kappa))$-generic. By Jech-Magidor-Mitchell-Prikry [7], in $K[G]$ there is a normal ideal $\mathcal{J}$ on $\aleph_2 = \kappa$ such that $P(\kappa)/\mathcal{J}$ is forcing equivalent to a σ-closed poset. By Theorem 5,

$$K[G] \models \mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$$

Now K is absolute for set forcing; so K is the core model from the point of view of $K[G]$. If $K[G]$ had a precipitous ideal on $\omega_1^{K[G]}$, then $\omega_1^{K[G]}$ would be measurable in K (see [21]). But since $\mathrm{Col}(\omega_1, < \kappa)$ preserves ω_1 then

$$\omega_1^{K[G]} = \omega_1^K$$

so it is impossible for $\omega_1^{K[G]}$ to be measurable in K. So $K[G]$ satisfies $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}_{\mathrm{gap}}$ but has no precipitous ideal on ω_1.

6. Some remarks about Strong Chang's Conjecture, special Aronszajn trees on ω_2, and bounded dagger principles

We call attention to the following two theorems:

Theorem 19 (Todorcevic-Torres Perez [16], Theorem 2.2)**.** *If CH fails and SCC^{cof}_{gap} holds, then there are no **special** Aronszajn trees on ω_2.*

Theorem 20 (Torres Perez-Wu [17], Theorem 3.1)**.** *If CH fails and SCC^{cof} holds, then there are no Aronszajn trees on ω_2 (i.e. the Tree Property holds at ω_2).*

Theorem 20 strengthens Theorem 19 by weakening the hypothesis and strengthening the conclusion. We observe that the hypothesis of Theorem 19 can in fact be weakened all the way to SCC, and the proof actually follows via a circuitous route from several older theorems:

Theorem 21. *If CH fails and SCC holds, then there are no **special** Aronszajn trees on ω_2.*

Theorem 21 follows immediately from the following three facts:

(1) Todorcevic (Lemma 6 of [15]) proved that SCC implies $\mathrm{WRP}([\omega_2]^\omega)$.
(2) $\mathrm{WRP}([\omega_2]^\omega)$ implies—in fact is equivalent to—the non-existence of a co-stationary, local club subset of $[\omega_2]^\omega$;[9] and
(3) If there is a special Aronszajn tree on ω_2 then there is a *thin* local club subset T of $[\omega_2]^\omega$ (Theorem 2.3 of Friedman-Krueger [5]);[10] and if CH fails then this T must be co-stationary in $[\omega_2]^\omega$, by a result of Baumgartner-Taylor (see Theorem 2.7 of [5]).

Note that while Theorem 20 subsumes Theorem 19 in a strong way, it does not subsume Theorem 21 because it uses $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$ instead of just SCC. In fact the proof of Theorem 20 heavily uses the "cofinal" requirement in the definition of $\mathrm{SCC}^{\mathrm{cof}}$.

[9] A set $T \subseteq [\omega_2]^\omega$ is called *local club* iff $T \cap [\beta]^\omega$ contains a club for every $\beta < \omega_2$.
[10] T is thin if for every $\beta < \omega_2$: $|\{a \cap \beta \mid a \in T\}| \leq \omega_1$.

Finally, we remark on a theorem of Usuba. Let $\dagger_{\omega_2}$ abbreviate the statement: every poset of size $\leq \omega_2$ which preserves stationary subsets of ω_1 is semiproper. Let

$$\mathbb{Q} := \mathrm{Add}(\omega) * \dot{\mathbb{C}}\big([\omega_2]^\omega - V\big)$$

We observe:

$$\dagger_{\omega_2} \implies \mathbb{Q} \text{ is semiproper} \tag{7}$$

To see this, first observe that $\mathbb{Q}$ *always* has the following properties:

- it preserves stationary subsets of ω_1 (see [5]);
- it has cardinality $\max\{\omega_2, 2^\omega\}$

Now Usuba (Theorem 1.7 of [18]) proved that $\dagger_{\omega_2}$ implies $2^\omega \leq \omega_2$.[11] So if $\dagger_{\omega_2}$ holds then in particular

$$|\mathbb{Q}| = \max\{\omega_2, 2^\omega\} = \omega_2$$

and since $\mathbb{Q}$ preserves stationary subsets of ω_1 then $\dagger_{\omega_2}$ applies to it. Thus $\mathbb{Q}$ is semiproper.

References

[1] Philipp Doebler, *Rado's conjecture implies that all stationary set preserving forcings are semiproper*, J. Math. Log. **13** (2013), no. 1, 1350001, 8, DOI 10.1142/S0219061313500013. MR3065118

[2] Philipp Doebler and Ralf Schindler, Π_2 *consequences of BMM plus* NS_{ω_1} *is precipitous and the semiproperness of stationary set preserving forcings*, Math. Res. Lett. **16** (2009), no. 5, 797–815.

[3] Matthew Foreman and Menachem Magidor, *Large cardinals and definable counterexamples to the continuum hypothesis*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **76** (1995), no. 1, 47–97. MR1359154 (96k:03124)

[4] M. Foreman, M. Magidor, and S. Shelah, *Martin's maximum, saturated ideals, and nonregular ultrafilters. I*, Ann. of Math. (2) **127** (1988), no. 1, 1–47. MR924672 (89f:03043)

[5] Sy-David Friedman and John Krueger, *Thin stationary sets and disjoint club sequences*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **359** (2007), no. 5, 2407–2420 (electronic), DOI 10.1090/S0002-9947-06-04163-8. MR2276627

[6] Moti Gitik, *Nonsplitting subset of* $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$, J. Symbolic Logic **50** (1985), no. 4, 881–894 (1986). MR820120 (87g:03054)

[7] T. Jech, M. Magidor, W. Mitchell, and K. Prikry, *Precipitous ideals*, J. Symbolic Logic **45** (1980), no. 1, 1–8. MR560220 (81h:03097)

[8] Ronald Jensen and John Steel, *K without the measurable*, J. Symbolic Logic **78** (2013), no. 3, 708–734. MR3135495

[9] John Krueger, *Internal approachability and reflection*, J. Math. Log. **8** (2008), no. 1, 23–39, DOI 10.1142/S0219061308000701. MR2674000 (2011i:03046)

[10] Paul Larson and Saharon Shelah, *Bounding by canonical functions, with CH*, J. Math. Log. **3** (2003), no. 2, 193–215. MR2030084 (2005f:03080)

[11] Hiroshi Sakai, *Semiproper ideals*, Fund. Math. **186** (2005), no. 3, 251–267, DOI 10.4064/fm186-3-4. MR2191239 (2006k:03103)

[12] I. Sharpe and P. D. Welch, *Greatly Erdős cardinals with some generalizations to the Chang and Ramsey properties*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **162** (2011), no. 11, 863–902, DOI 10.1016/j.apal.2011.04.002. MR2817562

[13] Saharon Shelah, *Proper and improper forcing*, 2nd ed., Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998. MR1623206 (98m:03002)

[14] John R. Steel, *The core model iterability problem*, Lecture Notes in Logic, vol. 8, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996. MR1480175 (99k:03043)

[15] Stevo Todorčević, *Conjectures of Rado and Chang and cardinal arithmetic*, Finite and infinite combinatorics in sets and logic (Banff, AB, 1991), NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., vol. 411, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1993, pp. 385–398. MR1261218

[11] And SCC, though we won't use that.

[16] Stevo Todorčević and Víctor Torres Pérez, *Conjectures of Rado and Chang and special Aronszajn trees*, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **58** (2012), no. 4-5, 342–347, DOI 10.1002/malq.201110037. MR2965421

[17] Víctor Torres-Pérez and Liuzhen Wu, *Strong Chang's conjecture and the tree property at* ω_2. part B, Topology Appl. **196** (2015), no. part B, 999–1004. MR3431031

[18] Toshimichi Usuba, *Bounded dagger principles*, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **60** (2014), no. 4-5, 266–272, DOI 10.1002/malq.201300019. MR3248209

[19] Boban Veličković, *Forcing axioms and stationary sets*, Adv. Math. **94** (1992), no. 2, 256–284, DOI 10.1016/0001-8708(92)90038-M. MR1174395 (93k:03045)

[20] W. Hugh Woodin, *The axiom of determinacy, forcing axioms, and the nonstationary ideal*, Second revised edition, de Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications, vol. 1, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin, 2010. MR2723878

[21] Martin Zeman, *Inner models and large cardinals*, de Gruyter Series in Logic and its Applications, vol. 5, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2002. MR1876087 (2003a:03004)

E-mail address: scox9@vcu.edu

Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1015 Floyd Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23284, USA